

08/8/5 773


**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

 Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

08/015, 773

08/12/97

BALGARTNER

95-21

 GARY E. PARKER
 DYNES & ASSOCIATES, P.A.
 10150 LINDEN AVENUE EAST
 SUITE 100
 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20015

1810-1121

EXAMINER

LAZAR-WESLEY, E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1810

4

DATE MAILED:

10/22/97

 This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
 COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

OFFICE ACTION SUMMARY

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
- ☐ This action is FINAL.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 D.C. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire _____ month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☒ Claims 1-39 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- ☐ received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of Reference Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES -

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Art Unit: 1812

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-32, drawn to polynucleotides, expression vectors, transformed host cells and isolated polypeptides, classified in class 435, subclass 69.1.
 - II. Claims 33-38, drawn to method of detecting a ligand, classified in class 436, subclass 501.
 - III. Claim 39, drawn to an antibody, classified in class 530, subclass 387.1.

2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the polypeptides of Invention I can be used in a different process, like for example to produce antibodies.

The polynucleotides of Invention I and the method of detecting a ligand of Invention III are independent and distinct, wherein the polynucleotides cannot be used nor made by the method of Invention III.

Art Unit: 1812

Inventions I and III are related to different products. Although there are no provisions under the section for "Relationship of inventions" in MPEP806.05 for inventive groups that are directed to different products, restriction is deemed to be proper because these products appear to constitute patentably distinct inventions for the following reasons:

Groups I and III are directed to products that are distinct both physically and functionally, and are therefore patentably distinct. The proteins of invention I are related to the antibodies of invention III by virtue of being cognate antigens, which may be used for the production of the antibodies. Although the protein and antibody are related due to the necessary steric complementarity of the two, they are distinct inventions because they are physically and functionally distinct chemical entities, and because the proteins can be used in other and materially different processes from the use for production of the antibody, such as in pharmaceutical compositions, or in a diagnostic assay .

Inventions II and III are related but distinct, as the antibody of Invention III is not defined by means of detecting of Invention II, and as other distinct compounds could be detected.

3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, and because the searches required for each of the groups are different, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. A telephone call was made to Gary Parker on 10/6/97 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Art Unit: 1812

Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(h).

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eliane Lazar-Wesley, PhD, whose telephone number is (703) 305 4059. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Walsh, can be reached on (703) 308-2957.

Official papers filed by fax should be directed to (703) 308 4242. Faxed draft or informal communications with the examiner should be directed to (703) 308-0294.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [stephen.walsh@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

ELW
ELW
October 15, 1997


LORRAINE M. SPECTOR
PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 1800